UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/549,323	09/26/2005	Frank Striggow	LNK-007	8223

31496 7590 07/27/2007

SMITH PATENT CONSULTING CONSULTING, LLC
3309 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER	
CLARK, AMY LYNN	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1655	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/549,323	STRIGGOW ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Amy L. Clark	1655	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 March 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *3-15,18 and 19* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,16 and 17* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *09/16/2005; 04/19/2006*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Please withdraw the notice of non-compliance mailed out on 06/18/2007.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, Claims 1-6, 16 and 17, of treating and/or preventing cerebral ischemia as a result of cardiac infarction, hydrogenation products of frankincense extracts and a peritoneal solution (please note that the Examiner believes that Applicant meant a medicament for interperitoneal in the form of a solution, since peritoneal is not one of the options for the species election) in the reply filed on 03/30/2007 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the grounds that the outstanding restriction requirement is improper, in whole or in part, because under the statute, if the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner *must* examine it on the merit even though it includes claims to independent and distinct inventions. Applicant further argues that in this case, the search required for the elected method of Group I overlaps with, and indeed is central to, the search required for the non-elected method of Group II and, therefore, it would not be an undue burden for the Examiner to consider claims 1-19 together in the present application. Applicant further argues that such a requirement for a species election is improper in that the division of the present invention into innumerable distinct species is unduly restrictive mad therefore constitutes an undue burden on Applicants. Applicant further argues that restriction among groups within a Markush claim is *per se* improper if it can be shown that the members of the Markush group share (a) a common

utility and (b) a substantial structural feature essential to that utility. Applicant further argues that in this case, Applicants respectfully submits that the Markush members set forth in claims 1 are so few in number and interrelated that no serious burden would be imposed upon the examiner to search the entirety of the claims. This is not found persuasive for the reasons set forth in the previous Office Action and for the reasons set forth below.

The inventions listed as Groups I and II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

Claim 7, at least, is anticipated by or obvious over Etzel (A*, US 5,720,975). Etzel teaches a method of treating Alzheimer's disease comprising administering to a patient in need an effective dosage of a medicament comprising at boswellic acid (See Claim 1). Consequently, the special technical feature which links the claims does not provide a contribution over the prior art, so unity of the invention is lacking.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

There is no common structural element shared by all the alternatives.

In response to Applicant's argument that the outstanding restriction requirement is improper, in whole or in part, because under the statute, if the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner *must* examine it on the merit even though it includes claims to independent and distinct inventions, please note that Applicant's application is a 371 of a PCT, which means that the election/restriction is made based upon whether the special technical feature which links the claims provides a contribution over the prior art, not with regards to whether examining the inventions is a burden. Please refer to MPEP 1850 (II), which states:

An international application should relate to only one invention or, if there is more than one invention, the inclusion of those inventions in one international application is only permitted if all inventions are so linked as to form a single general inventive concept (PCT Rule 13.1). With respect to a group of inventions claimed in an international application, unity of invention exists only when there is a technical relationship among the claimed inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features. The expression "special technical features" is defined in PCT Rule 13.2 as meaning those technical features that define a contribution which each of the inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art. The determination is made on the contents of the claims as interpreted in light of the description and drawings (if any).

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made **FINAL.**

Acknowledgement is also made of Applicant's amendment submitted on 03/30/2007, wherein claims 1 and 4-6 are amended. Due to the amendment of claims 1 and 4-6, a new election/restriction is required.

Currently, Claims 1-19 are pending.

Claims 3-16, 18 and 19 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected inventions and species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Claims 1, 2, 16 and 17 are currently under examination.

Specification

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: "A method of treating cerebral ischemia with (hydrogenation products of frankincense extracts)". Please write the appropriate definition of "hydrogenation products of frankincense extracts" that is intended to be used by Applicant in this method.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statements (IDS) were submitted on 09/16/2005 and 04/19/2006. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Please note that where the Examiner has written "Abstract only", only the Abstract was considered since this was the only portion of the prior art document supplied by Applicant that was written in English or translated into English. Please note that the Examiner has not considered the Kreck reference or the Safayahi reference (See the IDS submitted on 09/16/2005) because neither of these references were translated into English.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 2, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Enablement is considered in view of the *Wands* factors (MPEP 2164.O1(A)). These include: nature of the invention, breadth of the claims, guidance of the specification, the existence of working examples, state of the art predictability of the art and the amount of experimentation necessary. All of the Wands factors have been considered with regard to the instant claims, with the most relevant factors discussed below.

Nature of the Invention: The claims are drawn to a method of treating and/or preventing cerebral ischemia comprising the step of administering to a subject in need thereof a medicament comprising hydrogenation products of frankincense extracts as claim 1 and a method of treating and/or preventing cerebral ischemia, wherein the cerebral ischemia occurs as a result of cardiac infarction comprising the step of administering to a subject in need thereof a medicament comprising hydrogenation products of frankincense extracts as claim 2.

Breadth of the Claims: The claims are broad in that a therapeutically effective amount of a medicament comprising hydrogenation products of frankincense extracts may be administered to treat treating and/or preventing cerebral ischemia or to treat and/or prevent cerebral ischemia, wherein the cerebral ischemia occurs as a result of cardiac infarction in a patient. The complex nature of the subject matter of this invention is greatly exacerbated by the breadth of the claims.

Guidance of the Specification and Existence of Working Examples: The specification discloses a method of observing the effect of a frankincense extract containing boswellic acid on the infarct volume after experimentally induced transient focal cerebral ischemia (apoplexy), wherein Applicant discloses a method of experimental induction of a focal ischemia by intracerebral microinjection of endothelin 1 in the vicinity of the middle cerebral artery (eMCAO) and using Sprague Dawley rats, wherein the rats are intraperioneally injected with frankincense extract (See pages 16-19 of the originally filed specification). Please note that it appears that Applicant is disclosing a frankincense extract containing boswellic acid as the extract used in these trials. However, it should be noted that no other information is provided disclosing how the extract is obtained or what the extract actually is, therefore, it is unclear what Applicant is actually enabled for.

Furthermore, no working examples are provided with regard to a method of treating and/or preventing cerebral ischemia comprising the step of administering to a subject in need thereof a medicament comprising hydrogenation products of frankincense extracts or a method of treating and/or preventing cerebral ischemia,

wherein the cerebral ischemia occurs as a result of cardiac infarction comprising the step of administering to a subject in need thereof a medicament comprising hydrogenation products of frankincense extracts. Furthermore, no working examples are provided that demonstrate the efficacy of a medicament comprising hydrogenation products of frankincense extracts for treating and/or preventing cerebral ischemia treating and/or preventing cerebral ischemia or for treating and/or preventing cerebral ischemia, wherein the cerebral ischemia occurs as a result of cardiac infarction.

Predictability and State of the Art: The state of the art at the time the invention was made was unpredictable and underdeveloped. For example, Singer et al. (U, 'Associated systemic factors in cerebrovascular ischemia', South Med J. Vol. 69, No. 6 (June 1976) pp. 709-714) teaches that systematic disorders, such as cardiac disorders, are commonly recognized as predisposing and sometimes actual precipitating events in cerebral ischemia. Singer further teaches that a one-year comprehensive investigation of all patients with ischemic brain disease revealed that brain ischemia is more commonly precipitated by system illness than usually supposed, particularly transient ischemic attacks of the vertebrobasilar circulation and completed infarcts in the carotid distribution and that cardiac disorders outnumber all other precipitating events. Braune et al. (V, 'Cerebral infarct in the circulatory area of the arterial cerebrial media following chiropractic therapy of the cervical spine', Dtsch Med Wochenschr, Vol. 116, No. 27 (July 1991) pp. 1047-1050) teaches that chiropractic manipulation of the neck can occasionally cause severe neurological complications. Based upon the fact that the actual underlying cause of cerebral ischemia is unknown, it is doubtful that a

medicament comprising hydrogenation products of frankincense extracts is capable of preventing cerebral ischemia and of preventing cerebral ischemia that occurs as a result of cardiac infarction. Koudstaal (W, 'Anticoagulant treatment in stroke prevention'. Rev Neurol (Paris). Vol. 155, No. 9 (1999), pp 694-696) teaches that oral anticoagulation is the treatment of first choice in patients with atrial fibrillation (AF) and vascular risk factors and in AF patients with recent cerebral ischemia. Koudstaal further teaches that the treatment also substantially reduces the risk of stroke in patients after myocardial infarction and that the optimal target intensity of anticoagulation in stroke prevention is an International Normalized Ratio (INR) between 2.0 and 3.0. Koudstaal further teaches that the treatment has been found to be hazardous at INR intensities between 3.0 and 4.5 in patients with transient ischemic attack (TIA) or minor stroke of presumed arterial origin and that the value of the treatment in lower intensity in such patients still has to be established. Therefore, treatment, such as oral anticoagulation, of cerebral ischemia and of preventing cerebral ischemia that occurs as a result of cardiac infarction, are still being investigated and are currently still dangerous to patients.

Thus, while the claim-designated method may be useful for providing such an effect, Applicant does not disclose a method comprising the administration of a medicament comprising hydrogenation products of frankincense extracts for treating and/or preventing cerebral ischemia or to treat and/or prevent cerebral ischemia, wherein the cerebral ischemia occurs as a result of cardiac infarction. The Office further notes that while the specification discloses that the claim-designated methods and claim designated compositions will have utility in humans for treating and/or preventing

cerebral ischemia treating and/or preventing cerebral ischemia or for treating and/or preventing cerebral ischemia, wherein the cerebral ischemia occurs as a result of cardiac infarction, nowhere in the specification or in the limitations does Applicant direct the claimed subject matter to the administration of a medicament comprising hydrogenation products of frankincense extracts to any subject.

It should be noted that at the time of filing of the present application, the art of medicine did not recognize the administration of a medicament comprising hydrogenation products of frankincense extracts for treating and/or preventing cerebral ischemia treating and/or preventing cerebral ischemia or for treating and/or preventing cerebral ischemia, wherein the cerebral ischemia occurs as a result of cardiac infarction comprising the step of administering a medicament comprising hydrogenation products of frankincense extracts, wherein said medicament comprising hydrogenation products of frankincense extracts treats and/or prevents cerebral ischemia or to treats and/or prevents cerebral ischemia, wherein the cerebral ischemia occurs as a result of cardiac infarction in humans.

Amount of Experimentation Necessary: The quantity of experimentation necessary to carry out the claimed invention is high, as the skilled artisan could not rely on the prior art or instant specification to teach how to make and use a medicament comprising hydrogenation products of frankincense extracts for treating and/or preventing cerebral ischemia or treating and/or preventing cerebral ischemia, wherein the cerebral ischemia occurs as a result of cardiac infarction in humans. In order to carry out the claimed invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have to identify a

medicament comprising hydrogenation products of frankincense extracts that can be administered in a therapeutically effective dose with an acceptable level of side-effects.

In view of the breadth of the claims and the lack of guidance provided by the specification as well as the unpredictability of the art, the skilled artisan would have required an undue amount of experimentation to make and/or use the claimed invention. Therefore, Claims 1, 2, 16 and 17 are not considered to be fully enabled by the instant specification.

Claims 1, 2, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a "written description" rejection, rather than an enablement rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Applicant is directed to the Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, & 1 "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001.

Vas-Cath Inc. V. Mahurka, 19 USPQ2d 1111, states that applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention, for purposes of the "written description" inquiry, is "*whatever is now claimed*" (See page 1117).

A review of the language of the claim indicates that these claims are drawn to "A method of treating and/or preventing cerebral ischemia comprising the step of

administering to a subject in need thereof a medicament comprising hydrogenation products of frankincense extracts".

A description of a genus may be achieved by means of a recitation of a representative number of species falling within the scope of the genus or of a recitation of structural features common to the members of the genus, which features constitute a substantial portion of the genus. *Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly & Co.*, 119 F3d 1559, 1569, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1406 (Fed. Cir. 1997). In *Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly* (43 USPQ2d 1398-1412), the court held that a generic statement which defines a genus of nucleic acids by only their functional activity does not provide an adequate written description of the genus. The court indicated that, while applicants are not required to disclose every species encompassed by a genus, the description of the genus is achieved by the recitation of a representative number of species falling within the scope of the claimed genus. At section B (1), the court states "An adequate written description of a DNA ... requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties, not a mere wish or plan for obtaining the claimed chemical invention". Hence, an adequate written description of the ingredients requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it.

The description requirement of the patent statue requires a description of an invention, not an indication of a result that one might achieve if one made that invention. See *In re Wilder*, 736 F.2d 1516, 1521, 222 USPQ 369, 372-73 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Accordingly, describing "hydrogenation products of frankincense extracts", in the

absence of knowledge as to what the material consists of or the source of the material is not a description of the material.

In the instant case, Applicant discloses that "The invention thus provides the use of frankincense, frankincense extracts, substances contained in frankincense, the physiologically acceptable salts thereof, their derivatives and the physiologically acceptable salts thereof, pure boswellic acid, a physiologically acceptable salt of boswellic acid, a derivative of boswellic acid, a salt of a boswellic acid derivative or a boswellic acid-containing vegetable preparation for the production of a medicament for the prophylactic and/or therapeutic treatment of cranial/brain trauma and/or cerebral ischemia, on the one hand, and the use of the hydrogenation products of frankincense extracts, substances contained in frankincense, the physiologically acceptable salts thereof, their derivatives and the physiologically acceptable salts thereof, pure boswellic acid, a physiologically acceptable salt of boswellic acid, a derivative of boswellic acid, a salt of a boswellic acid derivative or a boswellic acid-containing vegetable preparation for the production of a medicament for the prophylactic and/or therapeutic treatment of cerebral ischemia, cranial/brain trauma and/or Alzheimer's disease, on the other hand" (See page 6). Applicant further discloses "However, hydrogenation products of other preparations with frankincense extract can also be used according to the invention. In particular it is possible to use according to the invention hydrogenation products of synthetically produced or naturally collected ingredients of frankincense, in particular acetyl-11-keto-.beta.-boswellic acid and/or 11-keto-.beta.-boswellic acid and/or .beta.-boswellic acid, optionally in admixture with .alpha.- and/or .gamma.-boswellic acid

and/or one or more of the boswellic acid derivatives preferably used according to the invention, as described above, for the production of the medicament" (See page 12), "However, hydrogenation products of other preparations containing frankincense extract can also be used according to the invention. In particular it is possible to use according to the invention hydrogenation products of synthetically produced or naturally obtained ingredients of frankincense, in particular acetyl-11-keto-.beta.-boswellicacid and/or 11-keto-.beta.-boswellic acid and/or .beta.-boswellic acid, optionally in admixture with .alpha.- and/or .gamma.-boswellic acid and/or one or more of the boswellic acid derivatives preferably used according to the invention, as described above, for the production of the medicament" and "Since the above frankincense products and the hydrogenated frankincense products have a very low toxicity, their compatibility is usually good. Subject to the severity of the disease to be treated and further factors, such as the duration of the disease, possible known patient's incompatibilities, the patient's general condition, etc., the dosages can easily be chosen by the attending physician. According to the invention the medicament is preferably formulated such that it is available in unit doses which can be administered, preferably orally, once or several times daily, in particular one to four times per day" (See page 13).

However, other than the examples within the specification described by Applicant, wherein Applicant simply states, "hydrogenation products of frankincense extracts", Applicant fails to adequately describe as to what Applicant defines or considers as "hydrogenation products of frankincense extracts". For example, nowhere in the present specification does Applicant render a definition of the term "hydrogenation

products of frankincense extracts" nor does Applicant cite an example of this term thereof.

One of skill in the art would not recognize from the disclosure that the applicant was in possession of the genus of what constitutes "hydrogenation products of frankincense extracts". The specification does not clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed (see *Vas-Cath* at page 1116).

Applicant is reminded that *Vas-Cath* makes clear that the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. 112 is severable from its enablement provision (see page 1115).

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 2, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The metes and bounds of claim 1 are uncertain because it is unclear as to the identification of the ingredients to which Applicant intends to direct the subject matter. Although the use of common names or traditional/ethanopharmacological names is permissible in patent applications, the standard Latin genus-species name of each ingredient should accompany non-technical nomenclature as a means for identifying the subject botanical as noted in this application. The common name or traditional/ethanopharmacological name may have several different Latin names

referring to various genus-species of the plant and it is unclear as to which genus and species Applicant is referring. The lack of clarity renders the claims indefinite since the resulting claims do not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Applicant may overcome the rejection by placing the genus-species name of "frankincense" in parentheses after the term "frankincense". Please make sure to write the Latin name in the proper format, wherein the first word is capitalized, the second word is lowercase and the entire name is italicized.

The metes and bounds of claim 1 are rendered uncertain by the phrase "hydrogenation products of frankincense extracts" because it is unclear what "hydrogenation products of frankincense extracts" are. "Hydrogenation products of frankincense extracts" could refer to products obtained from extraction of frankincense with solvents or simply be found within frankincense itself or the hydrogenation products could result from hydrogenating frankincense after the frankincense has been extracted or from the hydrogenating an extract of frankincense itself. Furthermore, what does Applicant mean by "frankincense extracts"? Is Applicant claiming a specific type of extract, such as aqueous or organic or is Applicant claiming a specific compound? The lack of clarity renders the claims indefinite since the resulting claims do not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired.

Please note that no art rejection has currently been made because the claims are so unclear and incomprehensible that a proper art search could not be performed. The

fact that no art rejection has been made does not indicate that no art exists or that the claims would be allowable if Applicant were to overcome the rejections above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amy L. Clark whose telephone number is (571) 272-1310. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terry McKelvey can be reached on (571) 272-0775. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MICHELE FLOOD
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Amy L. Clark
AU 1655

Amy L. Clark
July 12, 2007

Michele C. Flood